ED 326 909   CS 507 349

AUTHOR   Williams, David E.; Schaller, Kristi A.
TITLE   Peer Persuasion in the Classroom: A Naturalistic
              Study of Children's Dominance.
PUB DATE   Nov 90
NOTE   40p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
              Speech Communication Association (76th, Chicago, IL,
              November 1-4, 1990).
PUB TYPE   Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports -
              Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   *Assertiveness; Child Development; Interpersonal
              Communication; Kindergarten Children; Naturalistic
              Observation; *Peer Relationship; Persuasive
              Discourse; *Preschool Children; Preschool Education;
              *Social Cognition; Socialization; Speech
              Communication
IDENTIFIERS   Communication Behavior; *Dominant Behavior; Ohio

ABSTRACT
        Two naturalistic studies examined how children
attempt to exert dominance over their peers, which tactics are most
frequently used, and which appeals are most successful. The first
study identified 3 categories of dominance behavior by a 6-week
observation of playground interactions of 20 4- and 5-year-old
children. The second study, conducted at the same child care center 5
months later to quantify the findings of study one to provide
validity to the inductive constructs, coded 78 domineering behaviors,
counted the number of behaviors in each category, the sex of the
initiator(s) and target(s) and the success ratios. Results confirmed
that verbal assertiveness was the most frequently employed
domineering strategy of 4- and 5-year-old children, accounting for
72% of dominance behavior. Successful use of verbal assertion was
found most frequently when commands were given by assertive children
and when males attempted to dominate females. Domination of
same-sexed target and female assertiveness over males were successful
slightly more than half of the time. Results also revealed that
physical assertiveness (12% occurrence) seemed to serve as a
successful means for exerting dominance only when a child was able to
exhibit athletic superiority. The most significant finding was the
ability of some children to use theme plays to exert dominance over
their peers (13% occurrence), a strategy used most often by females
who feel confident that the target will play along with the scenario
and assume the submissive position. (One table containing the coded
domination attempts of children is included; 24 references are
attached.) (KEH)

Peer Persuasion in the Classroom:

A Naturalistic Study of Children's Dominance

David E. Williams
School of Speech Communication
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio 44242-0001

and

Kristi A. Schaller
School of Interpersonal Communication
Ohio University
Athens, Ohio 45701

Introduction

For many, the thought of children's dominance creates a vision of the stereotypical bully demanding the milk money of his much smaller victims. However, the construct of dominance has attracted the interest of many scholars who have explored the appeals and tactics of those attempting to dominate others as well as the formation of dominance hierarchies.

Most of this research, however, has taken place outside the communication field and particularly in the areas of psychology and child development. The dominance construct has, in our field, been a popular source for research since the 1970's but, we have primarily relied on studies of adult dominance. Communication scholars can contribute to the understanding of children's dominance by applying the communicative construct, as it has developed in our literature, to the study of children.

Such research would serve the dual scholarly purpose of expanding the understanding of dominance from the developmental and communicative perspectives. Additionally, this research could benefit teachers, counselors, parents and all others concerned with behavioral aspects of children. Therefore, this study will use a naturalistic perspective to examine how children attempt to exert dominance over their peers, which tactics are most frequently used and which appeals are most successful.

1

3

Overview of the Dominance Construct

Dominance may be defined both conceptually and operationally. Rogers-Millar and Millar (1979) defined the term as "the resultant phenomenon of the acceptance by alter of the one-up messages given by ego" (p. 240). Domineering behavior, conversely, was defined by Rogers-Millar and Millar as "the transmission of one-up messages" (p. 240). Domineeringness, then, consists of a one-up message that is transmitted from one individual to another, whereas dominance refers to "the transmission of one-up messages that are accepted with one-down statements from the other" (Courtright, Millar, & Rogers-Millar, 1979, p. 181). Therefore, dominance is a dyadic variable whereas domineeringness is a monadic variable. Dominance may be manifested through verbal, nonverbal, and physical behaviors.

As with other constructs in the communication literature, debate exists over whether dominance is best viewed as a trait or as a state. For example, Small, Shepherd Zeldin, and Savin-Williams (1983) provided evidence for a trait conceptualization of dominance. According to the researchers, differences exist between individuals in terms of dominance behaviors which are enacted, "and these differences are consistent across situations and stable over time" (p. 13).

On the other hand, dominance is viewed by some researchers as a state or situational variable. Bernstein

2

4

(1980), for example, argued that dominance is not a trait and asserted that it is a relationship between, or among, individuals and is manifested in various social contexts. Bernstein stated that dominance "is the property of an individual only within the context of a specific social organization; it is not a permanent characteristic of the individual" (p. 75).

Dominance relationships are heirarchically structured and are manifested in interactions among individuals (Pickert & Wall, 1981; Sluckin, 1980). For example, Pickert and Wall discovered that children perceived "toughness: as an aggressive characteristic or as a personality trait. Therefore, dominant behaviors such as "toughness" are arranged hierarchically, from most to least tough. The researchers concluded that dominance is a personality trait which influences an individual's behavior in various situations. Dominance heirarchies, according to Strayer and Strayer (1980), contain social power relations among members of various social groups. Thus dominance is viewed as either a trait or a state and research has been conducted in accordance with both of these conceptualizations. In order to effectively investigate dominance behaviors in children, it is necessary to examine children's communication behaviors in general. The next section of the paper will examine the literature on children's communication which is pertinent to the study of children's dominance.

Children and Communication

As with the literature on children's dominance, there is a paucity of research on children's communication. Existing research in this area, however, identifies specific skills which children possess, and the communication strategies that children use in conversations. In addition, this research indicates that children, even at early ages, use influence strategies in their interactions with others.

In a cross-disciplinary review of the literature on children and communication, Wartella and Reeves (1987) identified several conclusions. It was discovered that children begin learning converstational skills at birth, and are treated as partners in communication interactions with their parents. In addition, children acquire and display specific communicative strategies and pragmatic communication behaviors. These behaviors include maintenance of conversational topics, question asking, turn-taking, and so on.

Overall, the research reviewed by Wartella and Reeves (1987) indicates that children are active participants in communication interactions with others. Children's communicative skills develop over time and become more sophisticated as the child becomes more cognitively complex. In addition, the researchers argued that "consideration of communicative development, unlike language development, must include the cultural and social

4

conventions that provide information and through which children learn to communicate in a social context" (p. 620-621). Thus, children are active, thinking participants in their own communicative development, and there are many variables to be considered when studying children's communication behaviors.

Haslett (1983b) advocated a functional analysis approach to studying the communicative functions and strategies used by children. She argued that functional analyses are superior to speech act analyses because the latter do not provide the needed theoretical basis for examining developmental pragmatics. Haslett discovered that there were developmental differences in the various functions and strategies used by preschool children in their interactions with one another.

Specifically, the results of Haslett's (1983b) research indicated that a developmental pattern of language use was exhibited through the strategies used by children to achieve their conversational goals. The preschoolers who were studied were found to use projective and relational language functions predominantly. According to Haslett, the projective and relational functions "emphasize socially adapted speech; that is, these functions incorporate dialogue that is necessary to support mutual play activities or to deal interpersonally with another" (p. 124).

Thus, children's language use develops from an

5

7

individualistic to an interpersonal point of view. The
presch- lers were also found to use directive and
interpretative language functions. The particular
functions of language which were used tended to vary
according to the child's age, however. For example, the
relational and interpretative functions were used more than
the directive and projective functions by 3-year-olds,
reflecting the children's need to verbally control their
environment and to meet their egocentric needs. Haslett
(1983b) concluded that children's language functions
"become increasingly complex, both cognitively and
communicatively, over time. This strongly suggests that
pragmatic language functions are linked to the child's
cognitive as well as social growth" (p. 128).

In a separate study, Haslett (1984) explained the
development of pragmatic communication among children,
which occurs in four stages. In the first stage, infants
recognize that communication forms the basis for the
establishment of interpersonal relationships among
individuals. In the second stage. children begin to
understand such things as turn taking in converstations and
intentionality of communication, and learn to use language
to accomplish social goals. The third stage represents the
period when children begin to adapt their communicative
strategies according to who they talk to and in what
setting. The final stage is characterized by an evaluation
of the adequacy of both one's own and others' communication

6

8

messages.

Haslett (1984) argued for a communication based
approach to the study of children's communication
development. This is based on the assertion that "the
study of pragmatics should be viewed as the study of
communication- not language" (p. 253). Working from this
viewpoint, she has provided a model which outlines the
development of pragmatic communication among children.
This model illustrated that the development of
communication skills is closely aligned with language
acquistion and with the social and cognitive abilities of
children. Thus, even at very early ages, children develop
an awareness of themselves and others as communicators, and
also become aware of the various contexts in which they
communicate. Having examined the research on children's
communication, the review will now turn to an investigation
of the relevant literature on children's conceptions of
persuasion and children's use of persuasive skills.

Children and Persuasion

Research on children and persuasion indicates that
individuals develop and employ persuasive skills in
childhood. This research also reveals that children both
develop and respond to persuasive appeals in various social
contexts. Children use these skills in order to exert
influence over others in their environment.

In an investagation of children's conceptions of both
adult and peer authority, Laupa and Turiel (1986)

7

discovered that legitimacy of authority influenced

responses to commands. The researchers interviewed 48

elementary school students enrolled in either the first,

third, or fifth grade. Results revealed that the children

were able to conceptualize the role of authority and

accepted 'legitimate peer as well as adult authorities.

Specifically, when legitimizing authority, children take

into account both the social context and the status of the

individual giving a command. The children prioritized their

perceptions based on the age of the individual giving a

command, and the presence of legitimate authority. Thus,

peers and nonauthority figures were given less priority in

terms of obeying commands.

Laupa and Turiel (1986) asserted that the findings of

their research indicate a need to differentiate obedience

and legitimacy when assessing conceptions of authority.

Children apparently distinguish between these dimensions,

and tend to consider them separately from one another.

Nevertheless, the researchers concluded that children do

indeed prioritize their conception of, and subsequent

obedience to, authority figures.

The development of persuasive skills among children and

adolescents was examined by Clark and Della (1976).

Interviews were conducted with 58 children in grades two

through nine. The researchers discovered that, as children

grow older, they develop role taking abilities and their

use of persuasive strategies therefore becomes more

sophisticated. That is, higher-order strategies and more total arguments were used by the older children who were interviewed than by the younger children. The researchers concluded that, "as children mature they employ a set of persuasive strategies which reflect a more sophisticated ability to understand and adapt to the perspective of the other" (p. 1013).

Clark, O'Dell, and Willihnganz (1986) obtained results similar to the results of Clark and Delia (1976). The researchers examined children's use of compromise as an alternative to persuasive communicaton. They wished to determine whether a child, as he/she gets older, tends "to suggest compromise rather than to seek agreement with an initial desire in situations in which the child's needs and wants conflict with those of the other interactant" (p. 221). Interviews were conducted with 127 third, fourth, and sixth graders. Results revealed that the use of compromise as an alternative to persuasion was reported more often by the older children who were interviewed.

Clark, et. al. (1986) asserted that, as children mature, they develop more strategies for suggesting compromise. They concluded that, "the individual learns to accommodate the desire of other individuals and at the same time to pursue his/her own objectives in a variety of situations" (p. 223). Thus, with maturity comes a greater potential for meeting one's own interaction objecteves, while at the same time giving consideration to another

9

11

individuals' goals.

Bearison and Gass (1979) discovered that children between the ages of 10 and 11 1/2 possess the ability to recognize and utilize persuasive appeals in both hypothetical and practical social contexts. The children interviewed were asked to persuade someone to give them a small sum of money ($2.00). Thus, in the practical contexts, the children had an actual opportunity to earn the money.

The researchers discovered that children used more persuasive appeals in the practical than in the hypothetical situations. Simple requests were most often used in the hypothetical situations, followed by self-interest and other-directed requests. Mutual gain requests were not used in the hypothetical situations. In the practical contexts, self-interest requests were most often used, followed by other-directed and mutual gain requests. Simple requests were not used at all in the practical contexts. In a similar investigation of persuasive appeals, Jones (1985) discovered that children of all ages most frequently employed simple requests. Interviews were conducted with 109 elementary school aged children. An example of simple request was, "May I have it please?" Self- and other-oriented appeals were used less frequently. A self-oriented approach consisted of statements such as "I need to use the crayon; give it to me," while an other-oriented appeal consisted of a compromise.

10

12

Children were also more likely to grant requests in response to the persuasive appeals of friends rather than acquaintances. In addition, when requests were denied, the refusals were extended more for friends than for acquaintances. For example, acquaintances were refused with statements such as a curt "No," whereas friends were provided with an expanded explanation for the refusal.

The final section of the literature review will attempt to provide a link between children's communicative behaviors, persuasion, and dominance. In doing so, children's perceptions of dominance behaviors will be examined, as will research on children's use of such behaviors. Research on dominance heirarchies among children and adolescents will be examined as well.

<u>Children and Dominance</u>

Research on children's communication which was reviewed previously in the present paper indicated that children begin to develop and utilize communicative skills in infancy (Haslett, 1984). This developmental process of communication acquisition includes the use of dominant behaviors. This section of the paper will focus on research related to children's communication dominance behaviors.

Strayer and Strayer (1980) observed dominance behaviors in preschool children bewteen three and five years of age. They found that physical attacks, threats, and object/position struggles were all exhibited as forms of social dominance. Specifically, physical attacks that

11

occurred most often were hitting and pushing or pulling.
The researchers stressed the notion that dominance was an
interactive activity and research must focus on both
participants in the interaction. They stated that, "This
approach implicitly assumes that dominance between two
individuals is established by a mutual agreement symbolized
by the submissive response" (p. 154-155).

In an analysis of children's perceptions of dominance,
Pickert and Wall (1981) conceptually defined dominance as
"manipulation and control of other's behavior" (p. 75).
Dominance was operationally defined as "toughness" and
"getting one's own way" (p. 76). The children surveyed in
the study defined toughness as an aggressive characteristic
and said that a tough person was one who was stronger and
meaner and often fought with other children.

The children were asked to rank themselves and their
peers on both toughness and getting one's own way as
dimensions of dominance. Such rankings reflect the
heirarchical nature of the dominance construct. The
children surveyed in this study were able to construct
dominance heirarchies in order to describe their own and
their peers' behaviors. Results revealed that the children
consistently overranked themselves and others on toughness.
In addition, males were ranked higher than females on both
the toughness and getting one's own way dimensions.

Pickert and Wall (1981) thus concluded that the
children's descriptions indicated that dominance was viewed

as hierarchical and in terms of two dimensions.
Specifically, the children suggested that dominance was
both an outcome in terms of individuals getting their own
way, and also as a trait which was manifested in the
display of tough behaviors. The researchers asserted,
then, that dominacne was not accurately described as multi-
dimensional rather than unidimensional and should be
studied accordingly.

In another study on perceptions of dominance, Silverman
(1984) investigated self-, peer, and teacher ratings of
dominant behaviors. She discovered the the self-, peer,
and teacher ratings revealed no consistent patterns. That
is, the assessment of dominance among the three groups of
individuals were divergent. These results are contradictory
with the findings of Pickert and Wall (1981), indicating
the need for further research on perceptions of dominance.

Sluckin (1980) investigated the existence of dominance
hierarchies among preschool children. He discovered that
dominance hierarchies do indeed exist and actually begin to
develop at about four years of age. Further, Sluckin found
that children were able to recognize both dominant behaviors
and the existence of dominance hierarchies in dyads not
involving themselves. As Sluckin stated, "It is clear that
a behavioral dominance hierarchy is a valid descriptior of
the social structure that the child is experiencing" (p.
175).

Savin-Williams (1979) investigated dominance

13

15

hierarchies in early adolescents. He discovered that, among 12- to 14-year old males and females, dominance hierarchies were significantly correlated with rank orderings of the adolescents' leadership, physical maturity, and athletic ability. Results also revealed that males were more likely to display physically assertive behaviors, while females exhibited verbal evaluative behaviors. This finding indicates a need to examine gender differences in the display of dominant behaviors.

In a separate but related study, Savin-Williams (1980) examined dominance hierarchies in middle to late adolescent males. As with the previous study, it was found that dominance heirarchies developed among the adolescents, but the hierarchies were no longer correlated with leadership, physical maturity, and athletic ability. Among the 14-to 17-year olds who were studied, dominance rankings were correlated with such things as intelligence, popularity with peers, creativity, and so on.

Thus, physical expressions of dominance were less likely to occur among the older adolescents, and were replaced by such things as intelligence, popularity, and creative skills. Savin-Williams attributed this finding to similarities stature among late adolescent males. In other words, when disequalities in physical size can no longer be relied upon to naturally express dominance, individuals find other means of displaying this type of social influence.

The purpose of this secton has been to review the

14

literature on children's dominance. In doing so,
literature on the dominance construct, children's
communicaton, and children's use of persuasion has also
been reviewed. Much of the research on children's
dominance has been conducted outside of the communication
discipline. Therefore, such research has not focused on
the specific communication behaviors which are used by
children to achieve dominance over others.

An examination of the specific communication behaviors
which children use to display dominance over others would
provide a valuable contribution to the existing literature
in this area. Research conducted in naturalistic settings
would also prove to be beneficial. Naturalistic research
will provide a more accurate depiction of dominant episodes
which occur in children's communication interactions.
According to Savin-Williams, Small, and Shepherd Zelden
(1981), "the direct observation of behavior has greater
face validity than self-report measures since it is based
on how an individual actually behaves in specific
situations" (p. 175).

Method

The researchers chose to base this project in the
naturalistic perspective. The first study used
naturalistic observation to identify dominance and
domineering behavior in subjects. The second study was an
extension of the first. The first study identified three
categories of dominance behavior. The researchers

15

17

developed a checklist of these categories and, in the second study, counted the number of behaviors in each category, the sex of the initiator(s) and target(s) and the success ratios.

The naturalistic method was selected with the assumption that, by allowing the researcher(s) to become members of the groups being studied, the clearest interpretation and understanding of how children dominate or attempt to dominate peers would be reached.

The naturalistic paradigm, and methods for its implementation, has most recently been presented by Lincoln and Guba (1985). Lincoln and Guba asserted the naturalistic paradigm constitutes post-positivism. Some of the differences between the two paradigms were pointed out with the following conflicting axioms. First, concerning ontology, the positivists consider reality to be single, tangible and fragmentable whereas the naturalist assumes multiple realities which are constructed and holistic. Second, the positivist considers the knower and the known to be independent but, the naturalist views them as interactive and inseparable. The positivist paradigm allows for cause-effect linkages whereas the naturalist believes all entities simultaneously shape each other. Finally, positivists seek value-free inquiry whereas naturalistic inquiry is value bound.

Naturalistic study allows the researcher to build upon his or her tacit knowledge through the use of "humanly

16

18

implemented" methods. These methods include: interviews.
observations, document analysis, unobtrusive clues, etc.
Lincoln and Guba note "naturalistic studies are virtually
impossible to design in any definitive way before the study
is actually undertaken" (p. 187). However, the research
will consist of four basic steps: "purposive sampling,
inductive analysis of the data obtained from the sample,
development of grounded theory based on the inductive
analysis and projection of next steps in a constantly
emerging design" (p. 199-211). Final reporting of data from
a naturalistic study often takes the form of a case report.
However, reporting of the data for this study will take the
form of inductive constructs. This method is consistent
with Anderson's recommendations for reporting data of
qualitative research (p. 47). This will allow conclusions
to be formed in a manner similiar to traditional
communication research reports while maintaining the case
report advantage of thick description.

<div align="center">Design of Study</div>

The research for this study was conducted at a child
care center in southeastern Ohio. The researcher, in study
one, observed communicative behavior between three and five
days a week for a six week period. The participant
observation allowed the researcher to both watch dyadic
interactions from a short distance and become involved in
discussions and games. This interaction was essential to
the interpretation of observed behavior.

The researcher kept a daily journal of observations. The field notes were done in a manner not to attract attention or make the subjects aware that they were being observed. Additionally, counselors at the child care center frequently took notes, therefore the researcher's field note-taking would not seem unusual. After each observation period the researcher recorded, in detail, the days' observations along with perceived developing trends in dominant or domineering behavior. The researcher periodically referred to the field notes to develop and modify inductive constructs. The constructs were the results of the study which help explain how children exert dominance over their peers.

This study relied on Courtright, Millar and Rogers-Millar's definitions of dominance and domineering behavior. Dominance was defined as "the transmission of one-up messages that are accepted with one-down statements from the other" (Courtright, Millar & Rogers-Millar, 1979). Domineering was defined as "the transmission of one-up messages" (Courtright, Millar & Rogers-Millar). During observation the researcher noted each domineering attempt and the target's response. A judgment was then made to classify the transaction as domineering or dominance. The researcher's primary concern was in identifying verbal exchanges. Specifically, vocal volume, verbal aggressiveness and directives were thought to be important behaviors for observation. However, the researcher's chose

18

not to limit observation to these particular variables. The researchers were also concerned with identifying how play activities such as athletic ability, leadership and participation supported ones' efforts in dominance.

Study two used the three emergent inductive constructs, from study one, to develop a checklist. The second study involved a six-week observation period in which the researchers tallied domineering attempts according to the construct being used, the sex of the dominator(s) and target(s) and whether the attempt was successful. The purpose of this study was to quantify the findings of study one thus providing validity to the inductive constructs.

Subjects

Study one included approximately 20 children between the ages of four and five- years- old. Attendence each day would fluctuate slightly. However, the same 20 children remained enrolled in the child care center throughout the study. There was an equal number of males and females and all subjects appeared to be from middle to upper-middle income homes. The subjects were observed while at play in an enclosed playground. The playground included a swingset, monkey bars, a large tunnel, sand box, small equipment shed, a slide and loft and several surrounding trees. The children were supervised by three or four counselors of which the researcher was thought to be one. The children were allowed to play quiet or running games and several toys were provided. The counselors served to

19

Initiate and supervise games as well as manage conflicts
and provide general supervision over activities.

Study two was conducted at the same child care center
five months after study one. The same age group was
observed which included five of the same children from study
one. There was a total of approximately 15 children present
each day. For study two, the observation was conducted
during indoor play times to see if the dominance behaviors
would be the same as those observed outside.

The indoor facilities consisted of one large room with
several distinct activity areas. These areas included a
computer station, sand box, painting area, sink, loft with
stairs, reading center and open play area. The indoor
facility was also supervised by 3 or 4 counselors. The
activities were slightly more structured as groups of
children were schedualed for craft time and foreign
language tutoring.

Results

Results for study one were developed by close
examination of the field note texts and development of
episodes which provide descriptive sample accounts of
observed behavior. Specifically, the researcher identified
verbal assertiveness, physical assertiveness and theme plays
as constructs of children's dominance. The acceptence,
rejection or explanations of these constructs were found in
the observation of children's attempts to exert a one-up
behavior which would be followed by a one-down behavior from

20

the target.

Verbal Assertiveness

In this study directives, commands, arguments and
raising the voice constituted strategies for exerting
dominance. The early stages of the study found many
examples of subjects exerting dominance and achieving a
desired response or action through the use of directives.
Most examples were simple cases of "give me ...", "go get
..." or "hand me ..." which attempted to monitor the actions
of others. One game of particular interest was wiffle ball
batting while the researcher pitched the ball. One male was
able to direct the action of another male by stating "give
me a turn". Another example found a female directing her
friend to "follow me" to the monkey bars. These initial
findings proved to be misleading. After reviewing field
notes of several observations it was apparent that
directives were not used exclusively by dominant children.
All except the most reserved children attempted to employ
directives. Additionally, unsuccessful uses of dominance
were as frequent as successful attempts.

Commands were found to be used more exclusively by
dominant children and were more assertive than directives.
The most frequent cases were commands designed to make
another complete a task or stop doing something. One boy
was able to successfully command another to "stop throwing
it (a frisbee) over here". These appeals were used less
frequently and by fewer subjects but with a much higher

21

success rate than directives because only the more confident children were willing to use commands.

The only rejection occurred when strong commands were directed at children who were also dominant. These situations generally found the persuader being ignored by the target or the two became involved in a discussion with both making demands but neither willing to be subordinate. One dominant girl told another dominant girl to leave the area. The second girl refused and both continued to give reasons why the other should leave. This discussion was soon halted by one of the counselors.

Arguing and yelling were both used less frequently than directives and commands. These observations generally ended with neither subject clearly exerting dominance over the other. Either the two subjects in conflict were too committed to their stance to back down or the situation was halted by counselors. The only clear case of dominance being exerted through these means occured when a subject who had a much higher position in the dominance hierarchy yelled at someone in a lower position. Attempts at yelling up the hierarchy never succeeded.

Physical Assertiveness

Observation revealed three domineering techniques employed by subjects with only one having a high success rate. Pushing, shoving and object struggles along with game or activity participation had mixed results when used to exert dominance. However, athletic superiority was

22

sucessfully used by capable subjects to gain dominance over their peers.

Surprisingly, episodes of pushing, shoving and struggling over objects rarely resulted in one subject exerting dominance over the other. In cases of pushing and shoving the result was usually a short-lived struggle which was ended by a counselor or with both subjects stopping the conflict and arguing without conceding to the other. Object struggles consisted of fighting over a single toy and attempts by one to acquire a toy from another. Fights over single toys resulted in some sort of compromise or a mutual disinterest in the object. Again, this interaction was usually shortened or controlled by a counselor.

One instance found two boys fighting over a small shovel. The first had been digging a hole in the sand and the second approached him and said "here, let me do it now". With this he grabbed the shovel. The first boy attempted to grab it back as a counselor approached the two and worked out a compromise. Males were more likely to engage in these struggles and cases of mixed sex struggles were rare. The most violent struggle, however, was between a male and female and ended with neither emerging as more dominant.

A few of the more assertive subjects attempted to exert dominance by controlling games and activities. This occurred while playing games which required everyone to wait their turn. Only one child was consistently successful with this tactic. He was very assertive in his

23

requests and almost always excelled in the activity. Other

subjects only had moderate success when attempting to

control activities.

There was some indication that athletic superiority

helped subjects exert dominance. Boys who were good in

sporting activities, such as batting, were able to assume a

dominant role by telling others how to hit the ball. The

strongest indication of athletics leading to dominance was

seen by the desire of children to run after others. The

subjects who were faster than most others were able to

entice a group into running after them. After finally being

caught, or after the chase grew old, the one being chased

succeeded in determining the next activity or telling the

chasers to stop running or to go a. .

Theme Play

The most consistently successful means of domination was

exhibited by subjects who develop theme plays with the

target in a subordinate position. We offer the concept of

theme play as describing a behavior different than role

play. Theme plays occur when a child offers a play

situation which allows him/her to have a position of

dominance of the playmate(s).

Most theme play attempts were initiated by females over

females. Male initiated theme plays quickly turned into

play without a specific individual guiding the actions of

others. When females tried to engage males in theme plays

the success rate was lower. The males either lost interest

or played out the role without the guidance of the
initiator. The greatest number of theme plays involved
mother-daughter and big sister-little sister interactions.
One girl frequently approached smaller girls and proposed
that they play house. She would always suggest "I'll be the
mom and you be the baby". The target would agree and "mom"
would generally command "now you lay down and go to sleep"
and the target would comply. Other themes included a queen
and her servants and a ship captain and her shipmates.

Theme play initiators would assign positions or roles
and begin the action by only allowing the partner(s)
submissive responses. The initiator did this in one of two
ways. First, she would make a request of the target such as
"dig more" or "get out of the water." Second, the initiator
could talk down to the target such as "now be quiet baby" or
"you're a bad little sister".

These theme plays were only enacted by more outgoing
females and the researcher noticed that the theme play would
stop as soon as the initiator lost interest but rarely
before that. There were very few cases of theme play
attempts not working. Theme plays were initiated by those
near the top of the dominance hierarchy and their targets
were ranked below them. They were also successful because
the roles provided a form of play that was enjoyable for all
who participated and the less dominant subjects did not mind
assuming lower status roles.

25

Study Two

A total of 78 domineering behaviors were coded in study two. A chart of the final tallies for study two is provided in Appendix A. The researchers coded 56 verbal domineering attempts which constituted 72 percent of all observed behaviors. The greatest number of verbal domineering attempts (22) was found with a single male dominator and single male target. The success rate was modest as 12 of the 22 attempts (55%) allowed the initiator to receive a sumbissive response from the target but the other 10 attempts failed. Similar results were found for single female dominators with single female targets. Of the 14 attempts, eight were successful (57%) and six unsuccessful.

There were four cases of single male verbal assertiveness over single females and 13 cases of single female attempts directed at a single male. All four of the male attempts were successful whereas eight females succeeded and five failed. There were only three cases of a subject attempting to exert verbal dominance over more than one child at a time. A male was successful in exerting dominance over two females but another male was unsuccessful with a male and female target. On one occasion, a female successfully exerted dominance over two other females.

There were 12 cases of physical domineering behavior which accounted for 15 percent of all coded behaviors.

26

Only four of these domineering attempts were successul
(33%). Eight of the 12 attempts were initiated by a single
male upon a single male target. Three attempts were
successful but five did not result in a sumbissive response
(38%). The final four physical domineering attempts were
initiated by females against a single target. Three
females attempted to physically dominate another female but
all three attempts were unsuccessful. However, one female
did successfully physically dominate a male target.

Ten cases of subjects initiating a role play to exert
dominance were coded by the researchers. This accounted
for the final 12 percent of the 78 total observed behaviors.
All 10 role plays were successful. Eight of the role plays
were initiated by females. Three of these role plays had a
single female target and another three had a single male
target. One role play had two females as targets while the
final female initiated role play had a male and a female as
the targets. One of the male initiated role plays had a
single male target and the other had a single female target.
Discussion

Studies one and two confirm that verbal assertiveness is
the most frequently employed domineering strategy of four
and five -year -olds. Almost all subjects in study one
attempted to use directives and 72 percent of the observed
behaviors in study two were forms of verbal assertiveness.
Successful uses of verbal assertion were found most
frequently when commands were given by assertive children

27

and when males attempted to dominate females. Domination of same-sexed targets were successful slightly more than half of the time and female verbal assertiveness over males was also successful 61 percent of the time. Overall, verbal assertiveness was used the most but the use of commands was the only tactic which was frequently successful.

A possible explanation for the success of commands is found when referring to Laupa and Turiel's (1986) finding that children consider age, status and persuader tactics when deciding whether or not to comply. The children in study one who employed commands were more confident and outgoing in their interactions with others. Their targets may have viewed their status as a type of leader and the command tactic as one that should be obeyed. The use of commands, and other less successful verbal strategies, does not, however, show the ability to adapt messages as Clark, O'Dell and Willihnganz and O'Keefe and Delia found in older children.

Physical assertiveness seemed to serve as a successful means for exerting dominance only when a child was able to exhibit athletic superiority. Study one indicated that most other physical assertiveness techniques were unsuccessful and study two showed that physical tactics were used far less frequently than verbal techniques. This would seem to support Haslett's conclusion that although five -year -olds are still egocentric their communicative ability has greatly progressed since age three.

Savin-Williams found that 12 to 14 -year -old males and females relied on maturity, athletic ability and group leadership to determine ones' place in the dominance hierarchy. The emphasis placed on these physical qualities did not appear in her study of 14 to 18 -year -olds. The present study indicates that the emphasis of athletic ability on dominance hierarchy position may develop at a much earlier stage than previously realized. Apparently, four and five -year -olds' enjoyment of play activity carries with it a respect and admiration for those who excel in games.

Studies one and two provided significant reason to believe that the mos` extreme forms of verbal and physical assertiveness are not successful when used by children to exert dominance over peers. Neither arguing and yelling nor pushing, shoving and fighting over objects resulted in one child successfully exerting dominance over another.

The most insightful finding in this study was the ability of some children to use theme plays to exert dominance over their peers. The success rate of theme plays (100%) combined with their limited use (13% of all behaviors in study two) would suggest that this strategy is only employed by children who feel confident that the target will play along with the scenario and assume the submissive position.

Previous research poses a few partial explanations for the theme play phenomenon. Haslett's research has shown

that children learn to use persuasive appeals around age
four but are still ego-centric at age five. The theme play
users in these studies may be emerging from their ego-
centric stage and beginning to develop the early signs of
perspective taking ability. These children, in turn,
select peers who may still be ego-centric. The theme play
initiator can formulate a play scenario and provide roles
or characters for all those involved. The ego-centric
child can then function in the scenario because their
position has been established for them.

This explanation would suggest that children not only
develop perspective taking, but perspective assigning
abilities as well. This ability allows the child to
transform a play situation into a dominance situation by
assigning subordinate roles to peers. The theme play, when
seen as a means for assigning perspectives, is used as a
higher order form of influence. Della, Kline and Burleson
(1979) summarized "developmentally, more sophisticated
persuasive me_- ges may be legitimately regarded as those
which reflect higher levels of social perspective-taking"
(p. 242).

The question left unexplained, thus far, is why were
females much more likely than males to use theme plays. The
simple explanation may be that girls are more interested
than boys in developing theme plays. However, the reasoning
behind this may suggest that girls develop the perspective-
taking and perspective-assigning ability sooner than boys.

30

32

Whereas study two showed males and females attempted the same number of verbal dominance attempts (28 each) and males attempted twice as many physical attempts at dominance (eight to four) the role play construct which required the greatest cognitive complexity was dominanted by females eight to two.

Future research in children's dominance should consider three elements of our findings. First, we have proposed the use of theme play as a means for exerting dominance. This is a tactic newly associated with children's dominance and its validity should be tested further. Second, we announced the ability of children to assign perspectives. This also is a twist to traditional views of perspective taking and should be examined. Finally, we attempted to explain why females are much more likely to use theme plays than males but we do not claim to have provided the final answer to this question. One might begin to address this question with a study designed specifically to determine if young girls are superior to boys in perspective taking and perspective assigning.

Insights for kindergarten teachers

The findings of this study provide insights into the ways kindergarten age children exert dominance over their peers. These findings can be used by kindergarten teachers to recognize situations which might lead to one child influencing another. The teacher can also create situations which would allow children the opportunity to

exert influence. This section will highlight insights for kindergarten teachers dealing with their student's use of verbal assertativeness, physical assertativeness and theme plays.

Kindergarten teachers will probably not be suprised by the finding that verbal assertativeness is the most frequently employed verbal dominance srtategy. However, teachers should be aware that commands, as opposed to requests or yelling, is the most successful strategy and it is used by more confident and outgoing children. Furthermore, males and females are equally likely to exert verbal dominance.

Teachers can limit the opportunities for children to use commands by avoiding the use of dyads. In larger groups, children will be less likely to use commands. When children are placed together the teacher can limit the possibility of one dominating another by putting them in mixed-sex dyads. The teacher should also recognize that more outgoing children are going to attempt verbal assertiveness more often. Therefore, submissive children should not be frequently left unattended with more dominant kids.

Kindergarten teachers may be suprised by the inportance athletics and physical activity plays in children's dominance. Pushing, shoving and struggles are not nearly as successful for children attempting to exert dominance than the opportunities that arise from athletic and

32

34

physical superiority. This places a unique burden on the kindergarten teacher.

The ability for older students to use physical superiority to exert dominance is familiar to educators. Previous research has shown that 12 to 14 year -olds used athletic ability to exert dominance. Likewise, we are aware of the dangers of allowing children to choose teams for games. The inferior athletes are chosen last and can experience a lack of self-confidence. However, this study has shown that even kindergarten children will use athletic ability to exert dominance. Therefore, their teacher should be aware that those who win athletic games may also use their success to exert dominance over others. Teachers should also play physical activities that down play the winning aspect of athletics. The New Games approach should be employed for kindergarten children. These games de-emphasize winning and will limit the possibility of children dominating others. Teachers should also try to provide other means of self-concept developing activities for athletically inferior to average students.

Previous research has not addressed children's use of theme plays to exert dominance and we believe this may be new to kindergarten teachers as well. Teachers must be aware that their students can exert dominance by means other than verbal and physical assertiveness. Theme plays represent a much more subtle form of dominance which may escape the teacher's notice.

Teachers can use theme plays to give shy children an easier way to become more outgoing. Teachers could initiate theme plays and place a quiet child in the dominance position, i.e. mother, father, boss. By giving each student a role to play the shy child may feel more comfortable speaking up and influencing their peers.

This paper has taken a naturalistic approach to the study of children's dominance. Results were discussed in the categories of verbal assertativeness, physical assertativeness and theme plays. Results in the first two categories helped to explain and extend issues of the dominance construct addressed by other researchers. The use of theme plays, however, appears to be a new insight in children's dominance worthy of further investigation. The study was then completed with suggestions for kindergarten teachers.

References

Bearison, D.J., & Gass, S.T. (1979). Hypothetical and practical reasoning: Children's persuasive appeals in diffeent social contexts. Child Development, 50, 901-903

Bernstein, I.S. (1980). Dominance: A theoretical perspective for ethologists. In D.R. Omark, F.F. Strayer, and D.G. Freedman (Eds.), Dominance relations: An ethological view of human conflict and social interaction (pp. 71-84). New York: Garland STPM.

Clark, R.A., & Delia, J.G. (1976). The development of functional persuasive skills in childhood and early adolescence. Child Development, 47, 1008-1014.

Clark, R.A., O'Dell, L.L., & Willihnganz. (1986). The development of compromising as an alternative to persuasion. Central States Speech Journal, 37, 220-224.

Courtright, J.A., Millar, F.E., & Rogers-Millar, L.E. (1979). Domineeringness and dominance: Replication and expansion. Communication Monographs, 46, 179-192.

Delia, J.G., Kline, S.L., & Burleson, B.R. (1979). The development of persuasive communication strategies in kindergartners through twelfth-graders. Communication Monographs, 46

Haslett, B.J. (1983a). Preschoolers' communicative strategies in gaining compliance from peers: A developmental study. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 69, 84-99.

Haslett, B.J. (1983b). Communicative functions and strategies in children's conversations. Human Communication Research, 9, 114-129.

Haslett, B.J. (1984). Communication development in children. In R.N. Bostrom (Ed.), Communication yearbook 8 (pp. 198-266). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Jones, D.C. (1985). Persuasive appeals and responses to appeals among friends and acquaintances. Child Development, 56, 757-763.

Laupa, M., & Turiel, E. (1986). Children's conceptions of adult and peer authority. Child development, 56, 757-763.

Lincoln, Y.S. & Guba E. G. (1985). Naturalistic Inquiry Beverly Hills: Sage.

McQuillen, J.S., Higginbotham, D.C., & Cummings, M.C. (1984). Compliance-resisting behaviors: The effects of age, agent, and types of request. In R.N. Bostrom (Ed.), Communication yearbook 8 (pp. 747-762). Beverl Hills, CA: Sage.

Pickert, S.M., & Wall, S.M. (1981). An investigation of children's perceptions of dominance relations. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 52, 75-81.

Rogers-Millar, L.E., & Millar, F.E. (1979). Domineeringness and dominance: A transactional view. Human Communication Research, 5, 238-246.

Savin-Williams, R.C. (1979). Dominance hierarchies in groups of early adolescents. Child Development, 50, 923-935.

Savin-Williams, R.C. (1980). Dominance hierarchies in groups of middle tolate adolescent males. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 9, 75-85.

Savin-Williams R.C., Small, S.A., & Shepherd Zeldin, R. (1981). Dominance and altruism amond adolescent males: A comparison of etholgoical and psychological methdos. Ethology and Sociobiology, 2, 167-176.

Silverman, W.K. (1984). Self, peer, and teacher judgments of dominance in eight- and 12-year-old children. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 144, 291-292.

Sluckin, A.M. (1980). Dominance relationships in preschool children. In D.R. Omark, F.F. Strayer, & D.G. Freedman (Eds.), Dominance relations: An ethological view of human conflict and social interaction (pp. 159-176). New York: Garland STPM.

Small, S.A., Shepherd Zeldin, R., & Savin-Williams, R.C. (1983). In search of personality traits: A multimethod analysis of naturally occurring prosocial and dominance behavior. Journal of Personaality, 51, 1-16.

Smith, M.J. (1982). Persuasion and human action: A review and critique of social influence theories. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

36

Strayer, J., & Strayer. F.F.   (1980).   Preschool conflict
     and the assessment of social dominance.   In D.R. Omark,
     F.F. Strayer. & D.G. Freedman (Eds.), <u>Dominance</u>
     <u>relations: An ethological view of human conflict and</u>
     <u>social interaction</u> (pp. 287-297).   New York: Garland
     STPM.

Wartella, E., & Reeves, B.   (1987).   Communication and
     children.   In C.R. Berger and S.H. Chaffee (eds.),
     <u>Handbook of Communicatin Science</u> (pp. 619-650).
     Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

m/f	verbal	physical	role play
m	S 12	S 3	S 1
m	U 10	U 5	U
m	S 4	S	S 1
f	U	U	U
m	S	S	S
m,m	U	U	U
m	S 1	S	S
f,f	U	U	U
m	S	S	S
m,f	U 1	U	U
f	S 8	S	S 3
f	U 6	U 3	U
f	S 8	S 1	S 3
m	U 5	U	U
f	S 1	S	S 1
f,f	U	U	U
f	S	S	S
m,m	U	U	U
f	S	S	S 1
m,f	U	U	U

Note: S=successful, U=unsuccessful.